

Chapter 5

Emerging Challenges for the System of Architectural Studies

In this Chapter the system of studies will be the focal point. Last year many aspects of the advantages and disadvantages of the different systems applied in architectural studies in Europe have been expressed. Political, epistemological, philosophical and scientific arguments have been presented revealing polyphony of ideas, concepts and references. With the imperative demand to go ahead, we now need a clearer picture of the different approaches and their background. We need a better understanding of the others in order to better understand ourselves, our preferences, our fundamental educational strategies which will structure the contents of architectural studies and will ensure the expected profiles of the European Architect.

Introductory Synthesis by

Christopher Cross, Secretary of the SCHOSA, London, United Kingdom

David Porter, Head of Mackintosh School of Architecture, Glasgow, United Kingdom

Chaired by

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Emerging Challenges for the System of Architectural Studies

Christopher CROSS

Secretary of the SCHOSA*, London, United Kingdom

Introduction

This paper and my participation at Hania have been prompted by discussion with Constantin Spiridonidis after his much appreciated presentation at the SCHOSA Bucharest Conference held earlier this year. Constantin suggested the title and invited me to respond to the work of the last three years as reflected in the conference proceedings publications.

I am a practising architect, but have spent much of my life as a teacher. As a former head of the School of Architecture at Oxford I have attended a number of EAAE conferences and have twice been in Hania, but not for the last four years. Over the last two years I have been spending part of my time working with SCHOSA (The Standing Conference of Heads of Schools of Architecture) in the UK. SCHOSA has 42 members and represents the heads of all the UK schools in all the higher education institutions that provide courses in architecture with professional validation or pending validation. The Dublin schools in the Institute of Technology and UCD are also members.

SCHOSA main concerns may be summarised as follows:

- to simplify the over-regulation of architecture courses
- to make programmes more inclusive and more flexible in response to student need
- to make programmes more responsive to developing practice
- to influence the assessment of research so that architecture is better recognised
- to be better engaged with developments in Europe.

My comments are my own but made in the light of these concerns.

Overview of Hania conferences 2002/03/04

The proceedings at Hania over the last three years are documented in the publications *Transactions on Architectural Education Nos 13, 18 and 24*. It is worth noting the gaps in these numbers because they are a reminder of much other EAAE activity including the publication of works concerning the pedagogy of specific subject areas which began with the two volumes on construction teaching.

* Standing Conference of Heads of Schools of Architecture

The context for the conferences has been the EU ministerial decisions for implementation by 2010 - Bologna 1999, Prague 2001, Berlin 2003, and the EAAE Hania Statement 2001. These have prompted the conference themes and publication titles:

- 02 Towards a Common European Higher Architectural Education Area,
- 03 Shaping the European Higher Architectural Education Area,
- 04 Shaping the Architectural Curricula for the European Higher Education Area

2002

This was the first year of EU financial support channelled through ENHSA. In his summary Koenraad Van Cleempoel noted that the unanimous conclusion of 2001 was not repeated, the meeting was more pivotal and orientated towards the future role of EAAE and the annual heads meeting. He suggested that the meeting's rather introvert character was a sign that the so called European Higher Education Area was starting to become a reality with many obstacles ahead. The most pressing as identified by the organisers were discussed:

- Curricula of Architectural Education
- Exchange and Collaboration between Schools
- The Relationship between Education and the Professional Context
- Quality Assurance & Academic Assessment

It became apparent that the ground to be covered was too vast for one meeting so it was decided to set up working groups to work through the year and report to the 2003 meeting. These were to cover: (1) Profession & Education, (2) Assessment, (3) Curriculum BA-MA-PhD, (4) Exchange & Mobility, (5) Doctorates. I particularly value the reminder of key documents included in the Appendix.

2003

The working groups, established from the 2002 meeting, met during the year to agree methodology and strategies which led to the sending out of four questionnaires. The presentation of the results and analysis of the questionnaires was at the core of the meeting.

- It appeared clear that members wanted and appreciated specific information about different schools. The most important issues were; (1) length and content of internship, (2) criteria for accreditation/validation – with special reference to design, (3) consistency in the use of ECTS among schools of architecture.

Newly elected president James Horan saw the beginning of the maturity of the EAAE and the Hania meetings and proposed to make the organisation more visible within the EU. He would re-affirm the 2001 Hania Statement in Brussels and the fact that we should not dismiss the

Architect's Directive. In discussion of research there continued to be regret that design, the core business of the architectural discipline, was not properly recognised or evaluated by quality assessment.

2004

In his preface to the publication of the proceedings Constantin gave a reminder of how the prospect of the creation of the European Area for Higher Education had been the central theme of the Hania meetings of heads, with the wish to know what schools are doing and to know those involved in decision making for the future. He asked 'What should we do about our schools in the new and increasingly changing social and financial context?' At this 7th meeting of heads, he suggested that for the lively and dynamic milieu of the meetings to be kept alive it needed to be more than about an exchange of views and information and should be in a position to proceed to a more constructive and creative synthesis. The main objective of the meeting was to schedule the development of tools and mechanisms to more decisively support schools of architecture.

More specifically the meeting focussed on the curriculum, particularly the structure and content of studies and the learning outcomes and competencies to be ensured by studies. Competencies were suggested as divided into two groups; generic competencies to do with broader academic education, and subject specific competencies to do with practice and research. He noted that it was vital to discuss and agree on a rank order of learning outcomes and competencies to enable schools to structure their curricula.

In the light of the title of this paper, I noted especially the presentation by Ettore Deodato Chair of the Department of Thematic Networks as part of the Socrates Programme. He noted three challenges to shake academics out of cosy security; demographics, new information, and quality. On demographics, student numbers were not growing except in Eastern Europe where there were more female students. Universities now had to work harder to keep going and recruit in competition. Students wanted more accountability an access to different teaching modes – evenings etc, 'a sort of Copernican revolution', but Europe was behind on virtual campuses. Only 5% of students have moved with Erasmus! Students' parents and employers wanted to know which institution delivered the best results, quality assurance was needed to give consumer protection. As regards the thematic networks, he wanted them to be helpful in internal university quality assurance. He would like the networks to connect to other programmes that focused on secondary schools and adult education. He also wanted the Tuning methodology to be used to define discipline competencies by 2007 and for more emphasis on research. I will come back to these comments.

From the discussions about research I noted the comment about the US trying to drive through a super-academic research doctorate and a sub-professional or design doctorate. Francoise Schatz didn't think that research by project could be a doctoral thesis. Leen Van Duin stated that the need to explore the possibilities left to architecture as an autonomous discipline was greater than ever before. He also noted that in Chemistry and Engineering education was a spin-off from research. Kees Doevendans suggested that under Bologna there could be no funding for teaching at Masters level. In some institutions staff were being told not to educate students – to do research.

From many good points made in the discussion about practice I noted the comments by Art Oxenaar from the Amsterdam Academy about their programme structure and how they re-sorted the EU directive into three areas; more autonomous disciplinary competencies, contextual competencies, and professional competencies. It was the student's responsibility to acquire professional skills and give proof of them to the Academy which took practical training very seriously. He noted that the Maastricht Treaty had taken out a general requirement for two years practical training for competition reasons. James Horan wanted the schools and professions to start talking again.

Emerging Challenges for the System of Architectural Studies

I will limit my comments to four areas; the wider context - Europe and the World, students education and practice, quality assurance and academic assessment, and the EAAE/ENHSA.

The wider context - Europe and the World

It is quite an achievement to be gradually moving closer together and there are already many apparent benefits of closer contact that we see in the UK, but many in the UK are wary of over-cloying, over-regulated EU systems. Many are also nervous about the sharing of the Euro and how this may be limiting the economic development of some countries in the fiercely competitive world that we now live in and which has been noted at these meetings. We have to be careful that the Bologna pattern doesn't also become limiting.

This summer the respected global university rankings from the Shanghai Jiao Tong University were published. We should be concerned that there were only two European universities in the world's top twenty. In a recent article in the Independent Newspaper of London, the financial commentator Hamish Macrea noted that the English 'A' level (secondary) school examination system led students to specialise earlier and to complete university courses more quickly than in other countries. He suggested that the system worked well, the drop out rate was low and falling, and despite increased numbers, the value of the degree in terms of its benefit to users was the highest in Europe. Students were more satisfied by their university experience than in any other European country. And the UK was second only to the US in attracting international students with nearly 250,000. The new age of information and entrepreneurship needed people who could study a new and unfamiliar subject swiftly and at a high level, able to test arguments and defend judgements; people who were not just trying to get the right answer and get the grades. He noted that the UK had excellent one year taught Masters courses and raised concerns about European ponderous Masters degrees that take two years, and sometimes more, to complete.

Many of you might reasonably be uneasy about these comments, and at least ask what references the assertions are based on. Architecture is already an oddball in the UK system, and there are questions about comparisons between these UK degrees, typically 1200 hours/year and other European degrees 15-1600 hours/year. Elsewhere in Europe there are ten month academic years and no fees or low fees. My reasons for including Macrea's uncomfortable comments are to prompt more consideration of wider per-

spectives on education, not just to think hermetically about architecture, and to think from a student's point of view.

Students, education and practice

We have got used to polite respectful students who do what we want and study for years if that is what is required. But I think that this is changing. A UK university Vice-Chancellor told a SCHOSA meeting a few years ago that students had become 'knowing shoppers' looking for programmes that suited their particular needs.

We take students through long programmes when some might want to study shorter programmes to cover base line competence with the opportunity of studying later to specialise when they have found out what kind of architect they want to be. SCHOSA members have suggested that the base line competences to cover the requirements of the EC Directive could be covered in four years and perhaps even in a shorter period. Other discussions have rejected the idea of years of study. Instead we should be thinking of credits that can be picked up by students at their own pace and depending on their personal circumstances. Programmes could be structured to offer fast track routes for students who wanted these. Others may want to take programmes on a part-time basis. We should allow for conversion routes into architecture and a greater degree of inter-professional teaching. Aspects of professional experience could be credited academically. Overall we should shift the emphasis on to the student being in control of their own personal academic and professional development. To accommodate all this we need a range of flexible programmes offering students different opportunities.

From my experience, most students who study architecture want to be involved in making architecture. Of course their different talents may lead them to do this in different ways, but most want to be professionals as part of the construction industry. The profession and education should, ideally, be representative of those they serve. But in the UK, and I suspect in other countries, there has been a tradition that professional architects are primarily white, male, and from wealthier families. The situation is gradually changing with better female representation and there are moves to draw more from black and ethnic minorities. In the development of curricula, schools should be thoughtful about representing the values of this wider group.

Coming back to the points made by Ettore Deodato last year about demographics. He said that student numbers were not growing except to a small extent in Eastern Europe where there are more female students. Of course there is a limit to the number of 18 year olds. The question is what proportion of them goes into higher education. In the UK, 25 years ago 1 in 8 went into higher education, now the ratio is 1 in 3 and it is planned to move to 1 in 2. Whether this will be maintained will, in part, depend on how students and their families will respond to the new top-up fees that are being introduced in parts of the UK in 2006.

These will mean that full-time students will have to pay about E 4,500 for each academic year with repayments made over time when students income reaches a certain level. Most students build up debts as they study and these debts are going to increase. As noted at the conference last year, there may be little money to support education at Masters level with funding going primarily for research. While there will be financial support arrangements, the worry about debt may defer the very students from poorer fam-

ilies that we should be attracting to be more representative of our society. Some students may be reluctant to take on courses and particularly a longer course like architecture especially when the salaries earned by architects are not very high.

You can see why many students may be attracted by routes to qualification that combine academic and professional activity and allow them to earn while building up credits, thus avoiding some of the debts. These last comments are prompted by the particular situation in parts of the UK (it is different in Scotland!). But all governments face similar questions about financing education. They want wider participation but don't want to have to raise taxes to achieve it. That is why students may in future be asked to pay more of the cost and there is discussion of the profession taking greater responsibility. This reinforces the argument for a close relationship between education and practice. It is vital to work closely together and to respect what is best done in each context. Increasingly good practices do, or sponsor, research and many are specialists in certain areas. Bigger offices may be better resourced than schools and often have their own education programmes.

Drawing a wider range of students to study and a bigger proportion of the critical age group is another aspect of mobility.

Quality assurance and academic assessment

Ettore Deodato saw quality assurance and academic assessment as part of giving consumer protection. In the 2002 meeting Marvin Malecha said that the US seemed to have become obsessed with self-assessment and noted 5 different systems that schools had to take account of. The situation in the UK is if anything more onerous with 6 layers. SCHOSA has been working closely with the Architect's Registration Board who give prescription of courses and the RIBA who validate them, to try and simplify the arrangements and make them less onerous and expensive of staff time – students suffer. We are also encouraging reference back to the 1985 Directive (now incorporated into the new Qualifications Directive) as all that should be necessary to underpin the curriculum with each school making its own interpretation. As EAAE/ENHSA gets more drawn into quality assessment there must be great care to avoid a heavy hand. What is always needed is a light touch. The move in the UK is away from disruptive big visits at four or five year intervals to more reliance on annual monitoring. Such an arrangement suits the Architect's Registration Board who want assurance that every student getting the named qualification every year is competent.

EAAE/ENHSA

It is very good to have the mapping of what happens in each school and I hesitate to suggest more to do, but for it to really make sense it needs to be seen in the context of what young people do/learn before they become students and updated information on what their routes to becoming professionals afterwards are in the different countries. It would also be helpful to understand what the responsibilities of professionals in the different countries are and to consider how there could be less protectionism in the future. It would be interesting to find out how seriously the requirements of the EU Directive are taken and who monitors that they are being complied with. It would also be interesting

to hear the views on education of good practising architects who work across many different EU countries.

I respect the serious way in which the EAAE is developing in a more democratic way and the great spirit in which these conferences are conducted. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be here this year. I am sure that the UK Heads will be glad to give help in future developments.

Some Uncomfortable Things Concerning Attractiveness and Competitiveness

David PORTER

Mackintosh School of Architecture, Glasgow, United Kingdom

As a "synthesiser" I have been asked to provide an interpretation of the contributions made in the last three years as recorded in the Transactions of these meetings. Constantin asked for the fresh view from an educator who has not attended the recent Hania meetings to "stimulate interesting debate ... and to trigger off intriguing exchanges in the sessions that will follow your intervention".

I was advised that the themes that I tackle should not be limited within the borders prescribed by the agenda and should include an overview on and an insight into the perspectives of architectural education in Europe in the light of the EU policies for Higher Education. This is where I have concentrated my efforts.

As I began reading it became evident that one of the main topics for discussion here in Hania was that of mobility and exchange, but described in a way that I found rather mechanical, missing the real impact and experience of cultural exchange and of cultural differences. Mobility lies at the heart of the European policy imperatives, but its ambition seemed based on a simplistic assumption that exchange is always, by definition, a good thing, that the more exchange the better, and somehow, in an undefined way, mobility will bind us together. I will return to this but, for now, I was unconvinced by this listless vision of students like worker ants, constantly on the move.

The Transactions of the Hania Conferences

I then began to read the published Transactions more carefully. Each journal has two main sections – the major part is a record of the debates between the individuals and groups meeting each year here in Crete, contributing to our growing understanding of the European dimension to architectural education. The other section, at the back of each journal, provides a comprehensive archive of European policy and legislation that impact on higher education in our field.

Reading the debates and discussions of the European heads of schools - the impression grew of an organisation rapidly moving forward, collecting and exchanging data and views. This growing knowledge was fuelling an increasingly informed and confident debate. We know much more clearly where we stand and what we hold in common, and have a better understanding of our local differences. We have moved from broad generalisations to a more precise understanding. This is a considerable achievement in a short time.

Many discussions within this group have been provoked by policy making at a European level – the discussion of mobility being an example. The accumulating archive of policy

that forms the latter section of each of the Hania Transcripts has a wider historical spread than the debates, going back 20 years or more, including to the EU Directive of 1985 and the documents that lead up to and follow from the Bologna Declaration. Reading them I was struck that policies that I (and my staff) had often interpreted as coming from of the Glasgow School of Art (my institution) and the Scottish Parliament were in fact Europe wide, and therefore affect us all. With relief, I found that we are not alone in looking at quality assurance, credit ratings and the expanding importance of research.

As the head of an architecture school within a school of art, I became disappointed that the future was being described in terms of progress in science and technology. "Surely" I felt like saying "Europe may still have a role to play in the making of culture?" Surely the argument has been won that culture has a beneficial economic and social outcome, but the economics of culture seemed absent from this agenda. There was little here from our leaders about the university and its role in cultural production. I made a note: make sure that all bids for funding explain the most outlandishly avant-garde projects in terms of their scientific and technological spin-off.

As I read on, I became aware that the political rhetoric has been changing, and getting more urgent. I also became aware that there were some uncomfortable aspects of this changing political rhetoric that did not seem to have been debated here in Hania; topics such as "competitiveness", "attractiveness", "excellence" and "amalgamations". I felt that here were some uncomfortable topics that, alongside my uneasiness about the mobility issue, could respond to Dinos' request for topics that might "trigger off intriguing exchanges". So I intend to talk about the uncomfortable things that have perhaps as yet not received sufficient debate here in Hania.

Globalisation and the Real European Agenda

Behind the EU policy documents I found a mounting urgency derived from a realisation that Europe will not be able to retain an adequate standard of living for its citizens in the foreseeable future unless there is significant reform - away from a Europe of manufacture towards a Europe based on an advanced and networked knowledge economy. At the heart of this lies recognition of the need for Europe to be internationally competitive. The documents are shy of stating who we are in competition with, but initially there was the shadow of the United States of America and now increasingly of China and India. Research investment in the USA (double that of Europe by head of population) and the huge expansion of science and engineering graduates in the East provide the global perspective for policy making. The big issue is the effect of globalisation on European society and its higher education sector. The education of our students as architects is therefore perhaps not the most important thing; rather, it is their ability to earn a reasonable standard of living and enjoy a sufficient pension on retiring. That is what is at stake.

The document that I found most challenging and provocative has the title of "Themes of the Salamanca Conference on the Bologna Process", representing the ideas of over 300 European higher education institutions and found on page 283 of ENHSA Transaction on Higher Education no 13. The conference was held on March 29th and 30th March 2001, at the beginning of the three-year perspective I was asked to provide for the Hania Transactions. The proceedings of that conference, the follow-up to Bologna, address the

building of a "Europe of knowledge" and, among a raft of themes, calls for:

Competitiveness at Home and in the World

"Competitiveness is mainly the ability to be attractive to local and international students and teachers/researchers, in the global competition for reputation, talent and resources. Competition in global and European higher education is inevitable and growing....

Attractiveness

"To compete more on the global level, European higher education needs to have grown used to competition within the continent, and even at a national level. Being competitive requires a certain culture of behaviour and not just rhetoric. Once institutions have specific proposals to make themselves more attractive to students, researchers and staff, they could request more support from governments and from international organisations like the European Union."

Networks and Amalgamations

"In the face of increased competition, higher education systems will try to close the competitive gap at home so as to compete better abroad, e.g., they will weed out poor quality, introduce more quality labels, introduce nomenclature to allow their extra-university sector to compete internationally. The competitive gap will widen among institutions. More large-scale, trans-national university networks will develop, clustering around some prestigious institutions. They will trade in the global education market-place as a collective, but with the constituent members retaining their national identities."

This makes uncomfortable reading for many of us. Will "poor quality institutions" really be "weeded out"? Will schools that make themselves more attractive (whatever that means) receive more income from their governments? If there is to be national and international competition between schools then how will we deal with it? How will we start to talk about it? And, while we are here meeting together, should we be seeking out partners for possible amalgamations, while cautiously sizing-up the competition?

So far, from my reading of the Hania Transcripts, competition, excellence, and attractiveness have been the unspoken ghost agenda. There has been productive discussion about how to achieve second order objectives such as, mobility; comparability; a shared curriculum; appropriate learning outcomes and defining school profiles. Because of this, there was talk yesterday of Bologna being "over". I would suggest that we have come a long way in understanding and addressing these second-order objectives but that these constitute the "foothills" of Bologna not its summit. Bologna's summit is competitiveness in a global economy. Maybe this should be on the agenda for our next meeting?

Competition and Excellence

I want to explore two aspects of the so-far un-scaled "Bologna summit": excellence and its relationship to attractiveness.

The Salamanca report talks of "the freedom to compete..." with the clear implication that money will follow excellence. How do we define excellence in architectural education? Excellence can be defined for research and methods have been developed for doing so. And quality assurance provides ways to measure the effectiveness of programme delivery. But who and what will define excellence in design education? The logical answer should be that ENHSA and the EAAE have a central role in defining design excellence (who is better placed?) and that peer review will be the significant means to achieve this. It could be our body that defines creative excellence in design education.

The Salamanca report links excellence to attractiveness: *"Competitiveness is mainly the ability to be attractive to local and international students and teachers/researchers, in the global competition for reputation, talent and resources.* Seen in this light, mobility has another meaning – as a measure of the attractiveness of a school, where attractiveness is seen as a key aspect of excellence.

In the absence of any other, I offer my own definition of excellence and attractiveness in the teaching of studio design, based on long experience of teaching in different schools in the UK and across Europe. For me, excellence is recognisable through the intensity of intelligence and vision exhibited in the studio, and the rigour of execution and critique of projects. In my experience, these conditions attract good students and staff alike.

How is this excellence achieved? By a combination of good students and good staff, operating in a school with a creative culture, usually built up over time, generating an expectation, among students and staff, of exceptional performance.

There is another factor though – the studio can too easily become comfortable, a place to hide in our preconceptions and habits. We don't just need good students and staff; we need ones that bring a new critical distance through strangeness and foreignness to the studio culture. So this, for me, is the principle that should underlie mobility and exchange – it is the creative use of strangers in education that will help us achieve excellence. This rather than the "travel broadens the mind" platitudes should be the rationale for mobility.

Excellence, Attractiveness and Mobility

The Salamanca report talks of attractiveness in a very different way to this. It assumes that attractiveness is achieved through a flexible curriculum and mobility. To be frank, I have never heard a student say that they want to go to particular school because it has a flexible curriculum (maybe I meet the wrong students). The ones I meet travel because they think that it's location will be stimulating and exciting (a great benefit for the schools located in cultural hot-spots). And they chose schools that appear to have something special – in my experience; they go for schools that exhibit an ethos of intensity and rigour.

The rhetoric of attractiveness, flexibility and mobility employed in the European policy documents is strangely un-European, reflecting an individualistic and consumerist approach to education. They value the lone student in a European educational super-market. Perhaps in Europe we should be considering attraction and choice, not in terms of a super-market, but in terms of a city, a European city? What makes an attractive city? Great architecture (of course) but also an intense local culture with, in addition, a churning through of different imported cultures. If the city is in danger of becoming too famil-

lar, then undertake a derive to see it through new eyes. For it is the creative use of cultural difference that makes for a good city and a good school.

I want to turn the rationale for mobility on its head and suggest that the real advantages of mobility are not best judged through its effect on individuals, but its effect on the culture of schools as a whole, and that the advantage of mobility to a school is the importing of strangeness. Reading Bologna and Salamanca and so forth, the benefits of exchange and mobility are described from the point of view of the individual mobile student. Looked at purely from the student's point of view, mobility is a form of institutionalised listlessness. But seen in terms of the collective and dynamic culture of an architecture school, mobility can be a means to help achieve intensity in a school through by importing cultural difference. The new eyes brought by incoming students open new doors to new solutions and brings a new perspective for critical reflection. Importing some foreignness is a great way to help re-evaluate preconceptions and gain new perspectives. It's like inviting a foreign architect to build in our cities. It raises the cultural stakes.

The Experience of Mobility - Cultural Difference and Critical Distance

The benefits of exchange are usually explained in terms of how an individual mobile student learns about cultural differences through being exposed to new surroundings. What does this mean for the student? I want to share with you the experience of helping advise on a new Product Design course where some students are selected for exchange as part of a European masters programme. The students selected for masters spent four semesters in four different locations before returning to complete their course. The characteristics for selection are that the applicants are academically able and are confident, mature, outgoing, enquiring.... indeed the characteristics of students who will be mobile whether or not the system provides for them.

The students described their experience as stimulating and exciting, but some-times confusing: "like being thrown in the deep-end of a swimming pool". If this experience were offered to students who were not confident, mature, outgoing, enquiring.... the result would be one of trauma, rather than the experience of cultural diversity and difference. The experience of exchanging student is too rarely analysed and we lack the basis for evaluating it in educational terms, other than to repeat the cliché that "travel broadens the mind".

I propose a way of speaking about cultural difference to help understand and evaluate the benefits of "foreignness" as a crucial aspect of student exchange. This is based on my own experience, not as a student, but as of practicing as an architect in Holland over a number of years. I believe that cultural difference is experienced in three distinct phases, characterised as follows:

- Phase 1 Culture shock and finding "big" issues. I arrive and start searching immediate answers to questions of what makes "them" similar to me (football), and what makes them different (herrings). This results in quick, superficial and gross generalisations - "all Dutchmen are tall". And the sun always shines in Hania.
- Phase 2 Adjustment and discovering small confusing issues. In this phase I am discovering a lot of similarities but tripping up over unexpected differences. I am finding it hard to hold on to the gross generalisations, finding too many counter

examples. The ground seems less certain and the complexity of cultural situations becomes apparent.

Phase 3 Understanding the nuances and significant (if small) differences. By this time, I am learning to understand, value and deal with the small differences. I am beginning to appreciate that real cultural differences are complex, subtle, and fine-grained. They often lie in the small things.

I suggest that in most exchange situations the students start with phase 1 (culture shock) and move into phase 2 (adjustment and discovering small issues). But they go home before reaching phase 3. But I don't think this is a problem for them as individuals. They have time and will reflect on their experiences over time, gain a critical perspective and come to their own individual views.

More interesting to me is the potential for learning presented by their presence in the host school, offering the challenge to use the different cultural perspectives that they bring to help all students in the studio to gain a critical distance on their own work and assumptions about architectural culture. I believe this is the real benefit of mobility.

What I am suggesting here is a way of discussing student mobility where the main benefit is seen to be to the school rather than the individually mobile student. This recognises that the students who travel may remain a small and perhaps exceptional minority. Therefore the major benefit should be measured in terms of the impact of mobility on the creative studio culture of the predominantly local student community. This benefit is through incoming students bringing new cultural perspectives that can lend a new critical distance to everyone's creative work.

Describing the experience of being in the school is a way of trying to approach the "attractiveness" of a school to its students and teachers. In my experience, students will refer to the profile of a school when choosing to travel, but the decision is made on the basis of an international student grapevine that provides a sensitive feedback mechanism to answer the question "what is it really like....".

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear that this series of conferences has achieved a great deal. From my own stand point I have identified some topics that have been discussed before that may warrant further discussion - the benefits of mobility considered in terms of our schools rather than just the individual student; the need to find ways to evaluate the effect of cultural difference as experienced by both parties during exchange; the need to find subtle ways to describe the differences between schools and to recognise the factors that make a school attractive to a mobile student. This leads to the bigger political agenda of uncomfortable things that we need to air together, particularly the need to define and develop centres of excellence in the teaching of architecture and to deal with the political demand for competitiveness and the potential for networks and amalgamations.

So I will end with the list I have taken from the proceedings of the Salamanca Conference and have added some rather uncomfortable questions that, maybe next year, we could try to answer:

- 1) *To compete more on the global level, European higher education needs to have grown used to competition within the continent, and even at a national level. Being competitive requires a certain culture of behaviour and not just rhetoric.*

We need to find a way of talking about competitiveness between schools, between and within nations. Our political bosses are thinking this way. We need to think through how we will approach this – what will be the nature of our new "culture of behaviour"?

- 2) *"Competitiveness is mainly the ability to be attractive to local and international students and teachers/researchers, in the global competition for reputation, talent and resources. Competition in global and European higher education is inevitable and growing...."*

Once institutions have specific proposals to make themselves more attractive to students, researchers and staff, they could request more support from governments and from international organisations like the European Union.

Do we know what makes a school attractive to students, teachers and researchers? I have offered here my own working-definition for attractiveness/excellence as a start, waiting to be over-taken by more considered views. And how do we make our arguments for our attractiveness so compelling to the EU that they support us with extra funds?

- 3) *"In the face of increased competition, higher education systems will try to close the competitive gap at home so as to compete better abroad, e.g., they will weed out poor quality, introduce more quality labels, introduce nomenclature to allow their extra-university sector to compete internationally."*

The thrust of the European policy-making emphasises progress and investment in science and technology rather than cultural production. So what will the new "nomenclature" and the new quality labels be, and how will they relate to the teaching of design quality?

What is the role for the ENHSA and the EAEE in establishing the terms to discuss and the means to measure excellence in studio teaching?

- 4) *More large-scale, trans-national university networks will develop, clustering around some prestigious institutions. They will trade in the global education market-place as a collective, but with the constituent members retaining their national identities.*

This conference would seem to be the ideal place to explore networks. But will they only be between prestigious institutions? And who will define my school, or yours, as prestigious, or not?

Discussion

Chaired by

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Now we can go to the theme of this session, Emerging Challenges for the System of Architectural Studies. I would say that we have had two very clear and forthright presentations taken from somewhat different perspectives. To paraphrase Chris Cross just briefly, I think he put some uncomfortable questions to us; questions of credit versus practice, and what diversity might actually mean if we are serious about looking at this. In particular I think he was encouraging us to take questions of diversity and flexibility seriously and not to allow ourselves to be caught in inherited definitions of the way things should be and to be open to the possibility of the change in relationship between academia and practice. That is an issue that certainly has been raised here before, by Marvin Malecha in the framework of architectural and Urban Design workshop, from the perspective of the United States; it was perhaps understood in a different way but it had some of the same ideas behind it.

I think David has brought a different perspective as well. He was working from the perspective of the school of architecture and I think he raised some pretty fundamental questions about diversity and mobility and what they might mean, and I suppose trying to comb a little bit below the generality of the European agenda to see how we might give substance to some of these ideas that we are very fond of and these words that we are very happy to use, but perhaps less comfortable when it comes down to thinking how they might affect what we actually do ourselves. I think they have prepared a very fruitful basis for our discussion and I look forward now to broadening the perspective, to hear what people coming from different positions might have to offer on these and on other related issues. So now the floor is open to you and I am looking forward to an exchange of perspectives.

Guido Morbelli, Turin, Italy

I will not stick exactly to the theme, but I will take advantage of this to make some observations about the four points, many of which have been addressed today by the two previous speakers, and I will also go back a little bit to yesterday's discussion.

Concerning student mobility, I think that it is important, but I also think it is in demise. I believe that mobility between schools even within the same country is quite modest, because it is my understanding, although I do not have any figures that the majority of students are from what one might call the natural catchment area of each school. So I think that for obvious financial reasons students tend to be very much linked to the place where they were born or where they or their family lives. So while it is important to construct a philosophy about this mobility, I do think one need not get very heated about the problem. I do not think that there will ever be extensive mobility, unless the state or

other institutions help a lot.

Now, regarding the question of diversity, that is also linked to professional mobility. In this case I think it is important that our institution, the EAAE, promotes and fosters a standard curriculum, because it is necessary that the Schengen treaty should really be applied. For professional mobility means that someone who belongs to an architectural institution in one country can go to another country, open an office and sign designs. This, however, means that all these people, these European architects, must have had a more or less common background so that they will have had the same kind of studies and will have the same kind of professional knowledge. I think the EAAE can do a lot in this direction, especially if it becomes a more or less official consultant of the European Union in this respect.

Regarding the competition among schools, I think that this is a fascinating subject, but I strongly believe that it is not the curricula that attract people to one or another school, but the personality of teachers. I remember that when I was a student we were very unsatisfied with the traditional kind of teaching we had in Turin, and we loved to go to Venice because for us the better professors were there. To me it was a dream, because it would have meant the family opening up the wallet to help. This is very important, but it raises the difficult question of how can a school attract the best professors? This I think is almost impossible, because of course the first thing we think of is the money, to pay them better as one does in private competition, but this is impossible in countries like Italy where salaries are fixed by the state.

We all have the same salary, so there is no reason to go to another school, unless it is to be in a different environment with other colleagues. But I think this is also quite a problem.

The last point is flexibility, and in this case one can see how different the institutional situations are in European schools. I know the British system rather well, because I studied for three years in London and I also worked there. And I think that this is a point that emerges from what the previous speaker said: British schools are very free in choosing and constructing their curricula, because from what I know they can do anything as long as it is approved by the RIBA or the IRUK. This is not the same in Italy, because we have standard curricula imposed by the Ministry of Education and we have very little margin for flexibility. Our system is rigid. I cannot say absolutely that the British system is better and ours is worse, but as far as flexibility is concerned they have the advantage, because when you have a strong state organization (and in fact we are practically state employees with local differences) flexibility is an objective which is not easy to achieve. There is also an inherent rigidity in the system, in that when you want to make changes it takes an enormous amount of time because of all the ministerial bureaucracy that you have to deal with.

Chris Cross, London, United Kingdom

We do have the European Directive and its new presentation in the General Directive which is coming forward and which I would have thought is a pretty good guide to a curriculum. I am interested in, for instance, Aart's description last year of how they sort their requirements under this Directive into different areas; and there are questions about exactly what evidence you might look for to be satisfied that the Directive is being

responded to in schools. Personally I am nervous about going for something more complicated than that, but I do have a very real concern about the different rules and regulations of practice in different countries. At the very least it would be good just to see what these are in the twenty-five countries, just to look at them and try to see the arguments for them while they are in place, because if these stay as they are they must influence the way education works and limit the possibility of sharing in programmes. But it could be that we could learn across the different countries; the experience of how regulation has worked in one country could maybe encourage other ways of seeing it.

There are, I think, a lot of good arguments for the situation that I have had experience of, where students have experience of architectural practice before they are able to call themselves architects – I am nervous of somebody who comes straight out of a school and calls himself an architect to society. But otherwise I think what will affect these issues in the future will be that you will have to have insurance. You know, you would be very foolish to try and operate as an architect independently without some insurance cover, and the insurance companies will impose requirements.

David Porter, Glasgow, Scotland

What I want to say is this: I want to question where our responsibility as educators lies; and when I became Head of School five years ago, I felt pretty clear that it was to the profession. However, I have changed my mind. I think we have a responsibility to the students. I also have a responsibility to my employer – that is written into my contract –, who ultimately is the Scottish Government, and their view is that we should increase the employability of our students. But that is not specific to the architectural profession. They do not expect that every student we educate will become an architect – although in my school the vast majority do become practising architects – and therefore they define employability in terms of the skills that a student acquires from a course that will enable him to go out and be employed and maybe change careers. So what they are looking for are not subject-specific employment characteristics, such as the ability to calculate a beam: they are looking for the ability of a student to analyse, to work in a team, to deal with knowledge at particular levels; they are looking for much more generic skills, and I think there is a danger of getting too caught up in the professional sort of viewpoint that we are only educating people to enter what is in many countries a rather restricted profession. We must not box ourselves in like this. I have to say that in doing so we do not want to lose what I talked about earlier, which is excellence and intensity and rigour. This requires a balancing act, but if we have a standard curriculum we have to make sure that it is one that is intellectually demanding beyond just the discipline of architecture.

Jordi Querol, Barcelona, Spain

This last winter in Barcelona the Order to which the Catalan architects belong organised a competition, which at first glance seems a little crazy. Architects entered their names on a list, then we put the issues on the table and then each architect had to defend one position. One issue was, for instance, whether they thought the Cathedral in Valladolid should be finished or whether it should be stopped. The crazy part of this competition was that the architects who put their names down did not know until later what position they would be defending. It was a very interesting thing to see how well an architect can

defend an issue which he has not prepared for, because of course there are ways to defend almost any position.

This morning I would like to congratulate both speakers for having explained two different positions nicely and intelligently. Now I would like to contribute a couple of ideas of my own. First of all, and I am sorry to come back to the experience of my town, but it is the common and virtually universal practice that our students in Barcelona go to university during the morning and work with architects during the afternoon. The problem with that (which has been resolved) was one of payment. An architect's money is white money, with tax and VAT and everything, so we cannot pay students unless they can give us a receipt. And so we got the universities involved, because they also want the students to be able work in the afternoon. This collaboration between the university and the practice is what I am bringing to the table. We only do this if the student has completed the three years. So this is by causality a meaning of the question of the three year cycle. You cannot be an architect, so what are you in society? Now after three years you are able to work in the office of an architect because the university is the one that issues the receipt.

The second thing – which is not something we do, I just thought of it sitting here listening to you – is why do the schools not declare that this mobility that you explained sarcastically and beautifully is only positive when you do it after the three years. When I remember my studies in the 50s and 60s in Barcelona, I remember only three good teachers. I remember the other ones as well, but I did not learn anything from them, or at least I think I did not learn anything. Just three good teachers, but those three good teachers that make something burn in my computer here were from those three years. So I have a feeling that we cannot talk against mobility because the mobility is here. I am in Shanghai every morning with my Internet. Who can go against this 21st century mobility, when you can move as much as you are prepared to because you know what to click? So I think, and I agree with that professor, that students should not move before three years. Not, 'I am going to Barcelona to do this credit, I am going to Strasbourg to do that credit'. No, they should to do it or at least I think it will be better for them to do it after the first three years.

So two points: three years in your town, in your culture with your friends to know those three good teachers that always exist – no more, but three good teachers always exist –, and then move wherever you want to in order to do the other credit. Thank you.

Karl Otto Ellefsen, Oslo, Norway

Just a small comment in this regard, a very interesting fact is that the UK has somehow been the avant-garde of university politics. You know, like Thatcher was the avant-garde of the modern new urban politics in a way. At least from a Scandinavian point of view, when you look at our Norwegian right-wing government, it seems that they have been taking all their ideas from the UK. They are greatly interested in the university politics of the UK and they look to British regulations and British systems for regulating university policy and education, including education in schools of architecture.

My first point is to say that this is why all of us should study what has happened in the English schools of architecture; and I have learned quite a lot from talking to 'refugees' coming from the English schools into the Scandinavian system, and they have been telling

me about what is happening, which is at once very interesting, very positive and very frightening.

My second point is that I totally agree, and I think it is a very important point to see, that we are now in a sort of second wave in university politics; the first wave was where all these assessments, securing and regulating a minimum standard came from, and now they are talking about excellence all the time. The question of excellence then becomes very important, as does defining what excellence is and how to measure it and how the governments define who is excellent, which brings us back to the question of differences. But in a way the most important problem in our schools at the moment is how to pursue excellence and how to convince the government that we really are excellent in order to get as much money as possible. I think that is the situation right now, to put it very frankly.

My third point is not as interesting, because in a way, although I am sorry to have to say this, the British have always had a strange relationship with what was abroad, and this is the starting point for the British discussion on mobility. Seen from our point of view mobility is not that much of a problem. We have problems with mobility in and out of schools with low standards. But when people go in and out of schools of a high standard it is a very nice situation for both parties.

Inger Lise Syversen, Oslo, Norway

I have two questions, one for each of the speakers. To begin with I would like to thank you for the very good introduction to the topic today. My first question is for you, Christopher. You say that mobility gives a limited experience. English is not my mother tongue and I know you are excellent in these hidden agendas in your language, so maybe I misunderstood you, in which case I am sorry and I ask you to forgive me, but when you say "keep on with open flexible systems" and then, regarding mobility, that "the students lose something when they are out", to my way of thinking they gain something else. And I must admit that I thought that this way of thinking, this idea of losing, was an old-fashioned mentality, which I thought was off the agenda now; but maybe I misunderstood you, so perhaps you could give me a more precise explanation of what they lose and what it was that you wanted them to gain instead.

Turning to the other speaker, David Porter, and referring to what you said this morning that "the benefit of mobility is the individual's contribution to the schools". It is an interesting assumption or conclusion concerning the outcome of mobility, but so far the pan-European programmes are mainly designed for the benefit of the students. They do not say anything about the benefit of the schools as such. So could you perhaps elaborate on how could we turn or recycle the benefits to the school from mobility back to the students? I know that there are social and cultural benefits of mobility; but there should also be some benefits of skill and approach to projects, so how can we set the parameters for that kind of benefit in the mobility programmes?

Christopher Cross, London, United Kingdom

I think perhaps I talked too quickly about mobility, and not clearly enough; but just to respond to what you are saying: first of all students are mobile. They are always going all around the world, and even when they are very poor students they seem to manage

to go to places. I was talking to a student in Edinburgh three days ago, and there was a reference to a building in Japan and the students said that they were there this summer. So they seem to be able to travel; but when it comes to exchanges in the Erasmus programme, we have noted (as was in the information last year from Ettore Deodato) that the number of students that come into the UK schools is greater than the number that go out. He suggested that students came in because they wanted to learn English, and that was the reason for the difference; he did not have a special view on the students going out.

When I said they lost something, I think one of the problems at the moment in the programmes we have is that, since they are so tightly regulated they tend to become even more tightly regulated with conditions that have to be satisfied, so that if a student goes somewhere else there is a worry that they will miss an essential part of the programme in the UK school, which will put them at a disadvantage, and they will have to do extra classes or whatever it requires to catch up because they may not be able to satisfy what they have to do to earn the points, to tick the list in a mobility programme. And I regret this enormously. I think it is wonderful for students do go to other countries; but if only a limited number do I think that is part of the problem, the fact of missing something in the course.

Another factor is, of course, that many students have to work in order to study; they would have to give up their jobs to study abroad, and would have difficulty finding a job in another country, and it might also be more expensive for them to live abroad. It would be a good thing if we could find out more clearly just why people are not going away; but certainly we note that the numbers are fewer than we would like and fewer than they used to be. I imagine David has an opinion on this.

David Porter, Glasgow, Scotland

You put a particular question to me. I think that what I was saying was quite simply that if you look at government-level thinking about mobility everything is posed in terms of the individual student moving, not the other way. And there is clearly a benefit to the individuals who are mobile: that is to say, I have a slight concern that they would be mobile anyway, because they are the bright, energetic and outward-going students. But I think the real benefit, and one that is much easier to articulate, explain and explore, is the benefit to the culture of the schools that receive them, the benefit of having six or seven or eight students in a group who come from Barcelona or from Oslo and what they bring to the mix. This I think is something that is possible to discuss within a school. However, my experience of trying to discuss this with individual students is that you only get anecdotes from them and you do not get beyond platitudes like "travel broadens the mind". I think that the interesting thing about mobility – and I think Chris is right: I think it is happening anyway, and these structures are running after the reality – is what that mobility brings to the culture of the school. And, as I said earlier, the appealing thing to me is how you intensify the culture of the school and how that experience of cultural difference can add a critical dimension to the intensification of that experience.

Richard Foqué, Antwerp, Belgium

The beautiful thing of course about awaiting your turn is that a couple of good colleagues

will inevitably make the remarks that you want to make yourself. So I only can endorse what my colleague from Norway was saying about excellence. I think that it is a very important point, and we should put out a reminder and really attempt to answer the question of what constitutes excellence, what the centre of excellence is and why should we go for it. That is one of the things I wanted to say, but I want to make two further observations.

One is that in all our talk about mobility we tend to focus on student mobility, which is of course important; but I think we should not forget about faculty mobility, which in my opinion is also important, but more difficult to achieve. There are a lot of constraints there, of course: the faculty are usually married, with children, and it is difficult with a family to go abroad for a long period; most of the faculty have their own practices, and it is difficult to be away from your office for a long time; and so on and so forth. But we have had a couple of small experiences with this, and I must say that it is very enriching for your school, because – if you have good people – it brings new methodology, new visions. So I think we should also focus on that aspect of mobility; and maybe as we are all responsible for our schools we should try to see how we can encourage and realise faculty mobility.

There is a second observation I want to make. In this morning's session a sort of strange paradox came up, it seems to me, and I refer to the morning session yesterday where we discovered or pleaded for the need to have a close relationship between the profession and academia. As I was listening very carefully to our two colleagues there speaking and giving their comments, it occurred to me that if you really plead for diversity and, as Chris was saying, open curricula, as open as possible without too many constraints and so on, then in my opinion you have a strange paradox: that the gap between education and the profession may widen if you go in that direction. I do not know how to cope with that, but it could perhaps be another point for discussion. So at the same time the gap may be widening and the other way may be even closer: I do not know, but it may lead to the point where you have two separate worlds. And these two worlds should be converging, because we are educating for the profession but not that alone. In any case the situation varies from country to country. In my country we have the Order of Architects, to which for example the interior architects do not belong, and the urban planners have their own separate organization too, with different rules and different conditions. So that is my remark, and that is the dichotomy that may arise and must be taken into consideration.

Gunnar Parelius, Trondheim, Norway

I am afraid I cannot be very precise, although there are very precise provocations here and I have to react to them more on a meta-level. I am wondering about the market economy. I am from a school in a country where we are still representative of the old systems that have to tumble down. We have a lot of money still at the school, and the state is still heavily involved, but the market economy is coming. So I do not doubt what you are telling us about the situation you are in, and we are going into that situation; but from my point of view I am still wondering: you are talking about the market economy, you are talking about power to the consumer, you are talking about competition, and things like that, and I think maybe you are under the pressure of the market economy. You are hostages, you are saying, to the market economy. And this is something like the Stock-

holm syndrome: loving the oppressors.

You are only talking about this as a good thing, and of course it is a good thing because you have to rectify this to get intensity and rigour into the schools. This is how to make old tired systems tumble down and make a new rigour. So of course it is a good thing; but on the other hand it could be only adapting to the new situation: you have to know how to react to it, to respond to it, and then look for how to rectify this. And one thing I see from students going abroad is a new ethics, because they are in different kinds of situations and they learn how to respond as responsible persons; and this is not part of the market economy in the usual terms, not if you are only adapting to it. So there are new questions coming up; it is not just a question of changing the old system, but we must address this situation as a whole and not just become hostages to the market economy.

I would not be the right person to ask about state intervention; but in some ways the state has never left us, and we have to re-think what the state does, and re-think what alternatives there are to market economy thinking; and I think the churches, for instance, would never totally submit to the market economy, for they are not only thinking of the consumers. So there are other aspects here that have to be addressed, and an issue that has to be put on the map again. My confusion is, where do we find these things? And this should be part of the discussions further on, when they accept the new situation that is the market economy.

Peter Gabrijelcic, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Christopher introduced us to the very important question of how to integrate practice into the credit system. I want to say why I think this question is so important. Our schools are not the same as they used to be. Ten years ago students did all their studying at the school, the design studio was their only contact with some kind of practice, and the universities were the only treasurers of the knowledge the students required. Today we have the Internet, and in many countries we have a lot of students, maybe all of them, especially at the Master's level, who are working in private seminars or offices or companies, partly for economic reasons and partly because they see it as a challenge. And maybe this is a way of life, a truth that we cannot be blind to. And maybe we should integrate this new existing situation into the system – but it has to be a system, because if we have a problem of recognition with our curricula and our schools, then we should in some way also recognize those companies or private studios, we should involve those special architects in schools as visiting teachers, give them that position, and students should work in their offices, but we should in some way define what kind of jobs they do – maybe competitions, involvement in some sort of research work, but not just to become skilled workers. But this has to be systematised, because it has to be international, European. And this is maybe one idea which our forum should represent to the European Commission for the recognition of professionals and maybe to Bologna.

Dimitris Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

A note on mobility: it is relative to the society we are talking about. You are here in Greece, and Greeks are all over the world working and studying. And when I say all over the world I mean all over the world, so there is no point in talking about mobility in this country for

the people of this country. So the question is, who are you talking about? For mobility in different countries is a totally different thing. That is one thing. That is why I did not enter the discussion, because I do not have the context to enter the discussion. Which society are we talking about? And if the discussion is about Europe, which parts of European society are you talking about? Persuading an English person to go away, or giving an opportunity for the best place for the Greek person's choice to go away, India, for example, or Britain?

Now let me move on to flexibility. "Keep flexible". I am referring to Christopher Cross. Yes, definitely, beyond any reasonable doubt, be flexible. This is not the question, however: the question is what to be flexible about and who is to be flexible? This is the problem of our time, and I will propose an agenda for the solution of this problem. It is: the question of the object, which is open; the question of the subject, which is open; the question of the method, which is open; and the question of the system. To take the question of the object: which profession are we dealing with, so that we can be flexible? Which is this profession? The profession which used to be four professions and now is sixteen and very soon is going to be thirty-two? Or a profession which is integrating, and if so how are we integrating?

Second is the social question. Christopher Cross also asked: the white western man or the black eastern woman, and why? And I say, both of them. Yes, the priority is with the black eastern woman, but why? For I am open-minded, because I have a big heart, because I am a friendly racist, and I like the blacks? No, that is even worse than being a real racist. A friendly racist who loves the blacks is a very bad influence. Now if I need the black eastern woman – and I do need the black eastern woman – it is because she thinks and acts in a way that I cannot, and that is very important for my survival. So that is the second part of the agenda, the social part.

Third, is the pedagogical question, which we did not raise in these discussions. Are we talking about the master-apprentice relationship or are we talking about a free teaching-student relationship, with mutual recognition and mutual choice? Now comes the question about the method. Suppose we accept integral education, and teaching relationships and the master-apprentice relationship, but in which context? In an international context, not a national one and with respect for difference. Respect for difference means also respect for similarity, which is a very different thing than to impose difference. So that is related to friendly racism and nationalism, which respects difference of course because it imposes difference.

Now, comes the final point, which is about the system and which encompasses four points. These are the question of the university, which was skipped, because we talked about the Bologna process and all these things that are obsolete – because the Bologna process is two things: the one is completed, which is the free market; and the second is to follow, which is quality assurance in the free market, because it is all very well to buy and sell education, but what is its quality? We have to be serious about these matters. And then there is the school within the university – we did not talk about that. And there is the teacher within the school – who appoints the teacher, who promotes the teacher. And there are degrees. So all these are for the agenda; if we do not go into them, then the discussion of mobility and flexibility and everything else is irrelevant. So I believe that eight years has closed...

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

I am sorry for the interruption, but some of what you are saying, Dimitri, is not being heard.

Dimitris Kotsakis, Thessaloniki, Greece

Do not worry; I will not start again... In eight years we have closed a circle and now we are beginning again. We are not continuing the discussions. The ninth year is going to be the first year, because this agenda has been developing in these eight years and we must be precise. This is my opinion and this is the time to say it.

Aart Oxenaar, Amsterdam, Netherlands

First of all, thanks again to Chris and David. I very much enjoyed in David's speech the threesome of competitiveness, excellence and cultural difference. Although all three are important, I would say that excellence is the one that is most important, at least as far as Heads of Schools are concerned, because it gives us an edge in being competitive and it gives us a position in this culturally very different field or area of European education. I also like the way you defined each culture within the schools as being steered by intensity and rigour. And from there I come to the point of mobility, because one very important aspect of how to keep this intensity and rigour, how to keep your own culture open and alive, is not so much student mobility or teacher mobility but the mobility of criticism, the mobility of visiting critics, coming from school to school.

We have began doing it more this year, and I hear that there are many other schools doing it, and from that a European body of critical educators, critical architects working in education, seems to be forming and seems to be going from school to school. Starting a European discussion on what quality and excellence can be, but having that discussion each time in a different culture, in a different school. And I think that that is a very interesting aspect: at least we are experiencing it as a very interesting thing happening to us, bringing in other cultures coming to discuss with us, not forcing us into a mould, not telling us how to do it, but just reacting to what they see; and repeating that over the years, repeating the group but also slowly changing it, helps us to sustain quality, keep the edges sharp. And I think that the EAAE has been very important in this: it helps us to look at other schools, to find the people who are good at this, to find the schools that might have the cultures you want to partner with. Maybe we could even consider whether the EAAE could play a role in keeping this kind of travelling circus going.

Hilde Heynen, Leuven, Belgium

I wanted to thank both speakers for their contribution. I must say that my own views are closer to those expressed by Christopher Cross than those of David Porter. I want to add just a comment regarding the issue of diversity, because I think it is important to differentiate between different levels there. I do agree that it is very important to broaden access to higher education and to open up for people with different cultural and class backgrounds, and that access to higher education in a large part of Europe is still too limited. On the other hand there is also the issue of gender diversity, which is articulated in a very different way, in that in most of the schools I know of the student body is at least half female, whereas at the faculty level women are an absolute minority. The propor-

tion of women Heads of School is even smaller, as we can see in this room. So I think that both things are very important: that we should enhance diversity at the level of access, that we should broaden the diversity of our student body, but at the same time we should also look at staff and how hiring procedures and assessments and all these kinds of things work to reinforce the male dominance there. I think this should be an issue.

Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway

Thank you for your two inspirational lectures. I have one remark for David Porter. I very much enjoyed your speech, because it put another type of language into the discussion, which I think after a certain number of years begins to be more and more necessary. We all know that creative teaching is a very complex matter, and in the end it frees itself from any type of programme, it frees itself for any type of scheme, and so on. First of all then, it states itself as a relationship between the teacher and a student, whether within a group or otherwise. For that reason you talked about the energy of the studio, you talked about the energy of the school; and we all know that if this energy exists, it produces, and if it does not exist, it does not produce. Therefore I find it puzzling, and maybe it is some sort of rhetoric, when you talk about and I quote you, "that the profile has a bla, bla,..". Because whether it is a studio, or the school itself, if it does not have a profile it does not work. And I am not talking about the political profile, nor am I talking necessarily about the profile that belongs to a particular type of programme, I am talking about what makes the studio go, and to find out what makes the studio go is beyond the programme, it is sort of beyond the chart itself, and for bringing that discussion forth, I thank you.

Jordan Radev, Sofia, Bulgaria

As a newcomer from an eastern country, for it is the first time I am here, it is a real pleasure to be with you. As a newcomer it is usual to have a lot of questions, and I am happy that the previous speaker asked and answered the question which I was going to ask; but there are still some few things that I would like to ask the speakers, because I do appreciate the topic we are discussing, which is very important, especially for our university after the changes of economic development, and we do not have so much experience as you. The problems that we have been facing these past fifteen years are basically ones of mobility, practice for the students, and culture. That is why this is so very important to us.

With regard to practice, I would like to say that during the so called planned economy we usually had the practice within the curriculum, so that the students went each year for fifteen days of practice as a regular part of their course. Nowadays, for reasons of democracy and human rights, they cancelled this practice, because they say that students are free and can go anywhere to complete their practice. And what happened? This: the university diversified into a labour market. Unknown agents come to the university advertising for their companies, asking for students to go and work in their offices. Even quite recently we had people coming from France and Italy just to ask for our students to go for 1-1½ years there for practice; but they especially asked for third or fourth year students. Bulgaria is developing rapidly, there is tremendous growth in the building industry, in architecture, building and construction, and there is a real lack of architects

and, especially, draughtsmen. So students are going away because these companies pay them very well, more than a minimum salary, just to draw and to stay there. But staying there means that they are in an architecture office or studio about twelve or fourteen hours a day. Can you imagine what the students are going to gain from this office and what they are losing? This is the question that my colleague answered very well.

In my opinion, the students are losing out, because second and third year students are not architects, and when they go to these companies and work as architects they are not in a position to solve the problems they face, and they must always ask the other people around them what to do and how to do it. They are wasting their time; and when they draw and nobody tells them what to do or answers their questions, they get nervous, and what happens is that the buildings start to fall down because the work that they presented to the builders was poor. This is one side of the coin, to be sure; but the next point is that the students are wasting their time and are not well educated well after finishing school. They do not want to interrupt their education; they want to go further with this, because they do not have money to survive, I mean to pay their fees and to pay their living expenses. So what do you say about that? How do we solve this problem? There was a very good proposal from Jordi Querol from Barcelona, that only after the third year should students be allowed mobility, but it is not human rights, it is not democracy. If you put this rule into action, how will the students react?

The next question is mobility. We used to have mobility fifteen years ago. I do not want to talk about those days, but I think it was really very good practice to go all over the world in regulated ways, and nowadays we have these Erasmus and Tempus programmes that give us a chance to go to different countries for mobility. But what happens with this mobility? We have a real problem with this credit system because the curriculum in, for example, Germany is quite different from the one in Bulgaria. The Bologna process says that it is an attempt to equalise the curricula between countries so that architects can go and work together. Our programme has now been recognised by RIBA, and do you know what happened? We have four British girls who come to Bulgaria to get their Diploma here in our school of architecture, because if they get their diploma here they do not have to go for part three. So they can become a member of RIBA with only part two, as a foreign diploma.

There are a lot of such people coming to our schools: for example we have about ten students in our school of architecture from Greece, we have students from Africa, from Romania, from F.Y. Republic of Macedonia; but these students are speculators: they do not know the language well and they have more money than Bulgarian students and they pay for their projects. We cannot understand whether they are really studying the subject and whether they have really studied the topic when they go to exams, or if they are offering money to their professors to get their credits, and what these students are going to do when they return to their own countries? So, when we discuss culture, mobility and practice, I find these three topics are very closely related to one another.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you very much. I think that there are two connected issues here, but I just wonder: you said something about the RIBA and the question of being able to practice and what that might mean and about people taking a part two qualification, and I would like to ask Lawrence to clarify for us what is the RIBA's position with regard to this, because I

have come across numerous bits of confusion in this regard.

Lawrence Johnston, Belfast, United Kingdom

I am very pleased to be here again for perhaps the eighth time. I am happy to help our colleague from Bulgaria, particularly with the positions of the ARB and the RIBA. I can help you, and at the moment I am helping some twenty Polish students who came from Warsaw and want to practice architecture in the UK. Perhaps it is not of much relevance to other people, because they are going through the Directive, but I am aware that there is a movement of students. I encourage mobility and I will be able to assist you with what they need to do in order to take your part two and come back into the UK to practice. And I am happy to help any other member, any other state that is in that position. It may be a very complex process but it is one that we can actually assist you with.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, Lawrence. I do not know if there is anybody still waiting to ask a question, but I was going to ask our two speakers to make statements just before we draw this session to a close, so we will do it in the same order in which they spoke. So, Chris, may I ask you to make a summation?

Christopher Cross, London, United Kingdom

Well, I have various reactions. I appreciate the comments made and I am certainly not against mobility: there is just an observed reality as to what students actually do. I also think that it is very important that it is seen as more than just individual students, and that others may go as well. It is a very good system if faculty can be mobile. But in terms of inclusiveness, some of the things I said were prompted by discussions in the schools group and also simply by observation of my local university in London – London Metropolitan University – which recruits from a very ethnically diverse area; and it is foolish if our programmes cannot accommodate the mix of people who live around the universities, so there is a kind of common sense in that.

In terms of the way in which schools may engage with practice, taking the same university, one of the things that they have been developing – and the group in which Florian Beigel and Philip Christou work is an example – is having a group of practicing architects in a school, teaching, doing research and practising from a base in the school. And that is a very interesting and healthy way of trying to connect to practice, to complement things happening the other way round, where there are practices which engage very fully with schools and an example in the UK would be the Feilden-Clegg practice, which has a very close connection with the school in Bath and are really doing very excellent work to do with buildings and the way they use energy.

When we talk about practice I think it is really important that schools engage not just with architectural practice: there are many other practices that are relevant to architecture, many other areas of expertise. It seems obvious that schools should have a good relationship with them, because there are sharp people there. Most obviously over the last few years have been the practices which have become really thoughtful about the ways buildings use energy. And I think that that questions all sorts of conventions we

have had about how we organise teaching. It seems to me that the way you think about building a building, the materials you might use, the construction system, the structure is all related to the consideration of how a building functions as an overall system, and we obviously want to try and make buildings that are very thoughtful at that level and that do not put too much strain on our planet. So I see no difficulties in working and engaging with people who are professionals outside education, and I think that we have a lot of common interests.

If there is any advice from the group of the schools in the UK it is that you cannot avoid dealing with bodies, like in your different countries you will have your professional associations and registration bodies or something, and you just have to be as nice to them as possible and work with them and persuade them that it is not their job to tell education what it has to do; but you negotiate with them. One of the papers that I brought with me was a paper from the RIBA, a man from a practice that now leads the RIBA education initiative, and he makes suggestions about developments in education which are broadly suggestions that we made to the RIBA and now we hear them coming back from the RIBA. So we tell them that it is a really good idea, and just go along with it. So that is how in a cooperative way we move things forward and make sure that education has its voice.

David Porter, Glasgow, Scotland

There were three particular points raised that I want to deal with quickly. Aart, I thought what you were saying about critique and the role of the critic and the mobility of criticism was very interesting, and I think that in trying to think about cultural diversity and cultural difference the big benefit is the critical distance that cultural difference gives; that can come through having a diverse student or a diverse teaching population, but it also comes from mobility. And this is something that we can talk about and articulate and help manage.

The second was about profiles. Per Olaf Fjeld, I think you slightly misunderstood what I was trying to say. I believe strongly that each school should have a profile. What I was trying to say was that the difficulty is to summarise it into a simple statement, because I think the real differences between schools are subtle. They reside in these subtle nuances of difference which are difficult to talk about but you can experience.

There is a third point that I think came rather earlier on from Karl Otto Ellefsen, who was talking about how to persuade about excellence. And talking of cultural differences, I spent the last five years in an art school, and it is very interesting to see the cultural difference between architecture and fine arts students. It is very interesting seeing them try to persuade people; they are trying to get money like all the rest of us, and they simply say "we are artists, give us money". But after a while people get a little frustrated and demand a good reason, and they say "we are artists, we do not give reasons, give us money", and that actually does put people's back up after a while. And I think that there is a certain danger here.

I was speaking earlier on about where our responsibility lies. I think that, if we are going to go forward in education in architecture – and I was a practicing architect and I strongly believe in the relationship between architectural education and built buildings – we have to put arguments to the government that do not look like special pleading on behalf of

the architectural profession. We have to put the argument in terms of what it enables students to do: "Oh! By the way, they can go into architecture as well..." So that is strategy, if you like.

Finally, there were a couple of comments about the market economy, and I wanted to tell you why I raised this issue. Am I the only head of school whose staff moan, whose staff complains? I came to a meeting here five years ago, just as I became head of school, and I have not been back since; and the reason is that we have had to bring in quality assurance, credit rating, put in a research infrastructure, health and safety, etc, etc., and now what my staff all say (and this is because we are part of the Glasgow School of Art) is "Bloody Glasgow School of Art! We just want to get on and teach and there is all this bureaucracy!" Am I alone in this? No, I did not think so. After a while I sat down with them and said, actually it is not just the Glasgow School of Art: this is the Scottish Parliament that is telling us to do this, and if you are really worried about it, vote in another lot at the next election. And then when I got these documents from Constantin, I realised that it is not the Scottish Parliament, the Socialist Democratic Government of Scotland, it is actually coming from across Europe; and the reason I raise this is that that is the political reality we are in and, more than that, it is the political reality our students will have to face. So it is not a matter of my staff who talk about resisting these bureaucratic changes, which is not a very useful position; it is that somehow we have to deal with these issues.

Loughlin Kealy, Dublin, Ireland

Thank you, David. OK. Are there any further responses to our speakers' summary statements? No? OK. I want to thank you all for your participation, and I want to thank our two speakers for their very stimulating contributions – they have given us much to think about. Thank you.

